Appl. No. .: 10/635,773

Amendment Dated November 1, 2006

Response to Office Action Mailed June 30, 2006

REMARKS

A. GENERALLY

Claims 1-57 remain in this application. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-13, 16, 18-20, 23, 25, 30-33, 35-39, 41-43, 46, 48, and 53-56 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

B. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. Claims 1-3, 8-11, 13-18, 20-22, 35-36, 39-40 and 43-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,377,963 to Walker et al. (hereinafter, "Walker") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,114,128 to Harris et al. (hereinafter, "Harris").

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, 23, 35, 37, and 39 to reflect that the "components" of the booklet are in fact "signatures" as that term is defined in the specification of the present application:

Signature - a sheet of paper printed on both sides that, when optionally folded and included in a document or booklet, constitutes a number of pages always divisible by 2 and typically 4 or some other power of 2.

The combination of Walker and Harris does not teach or reasonably suggest using a content control identifier received from a pre-printed custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient as recited in independent claims 1, 9, 16, 23, 35, 37, and 39 (as amended).

Based on the foregoing, claims 1-3, 8-11, 13-18, 20-22, 35-36, 39-40 and 43-45 recite limitations not taught or reasonably suggested by the combination of Walker and Harris. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-3, 8-11, 13-18, 20-22, 35-36, 39-40 and 43-45 be withdrawn.

2. Claims 4-7, 12, 19, 23-34, 37-38, 41-42, and 46-57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Walker and Harris as

Appl. No. : 10/635,773 Amendment Dated November 1, 2006 Response to Office Action Mailed June 30, 2006

specified in claim 1 above and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,875,383 to Stemmle (hereinafter, "Stemmle").

Claims 4-7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 (as amended) and therefore recite the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a preprinted custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claims 4-7. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claims 4-7 and requests that the rejection of claims 4-7 be withdrawn.

Claim 12 depends directly or indirectly from claim 9 (as amended) and therefore recites the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a preprinted custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claim 12 and requests that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from claim 16 (as amended) and therefore recites the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a pre-printed custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient,

Appl. No. : 10/635,773 Amendment Dated November 1, 2006 Response to Office Action Mailed June 30, 2006

using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claim 19. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claim 19 and requests that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 24-34 depend directly or indirectly from claim 23 (as amended) and therefore recite the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a pre-printed custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claims 23-34. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claims 23-34 and requests that the rejection of claims 23-34 be withdrawn.

Claim 38 depends from claim 37 (as amended) and therefore recite the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a pre-printed custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably

Appl. No. .: 10/635,773

Amendment Dated November 1, 2006

Response to Office Action Mailed June 30, 2006

disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claims 37-38. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claims 37-38 and requests that the rejection of claims 37-38 be withdrawn.

Claims 41-42 depend directly or indirectly from claim 39 (as amended) and therefore recite the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a pre-printed custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claims 41-42. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claims 41-42 and requests that the rejection of claims 41-42 be withdrawn.

Claims 47-57 depend directly or indirectly from claim 46 (as amended) and therefore recite the limitations directed to using a content control identifier received from a pre-printed custom booklet signature to obtain instructions associated with the targeted recipient, using the instructions to create a just-printed custom booklet signature for the targeted recipient, and using the instructions to marry the pre-printed custom booklet signature and the just-printed custom booklet signature to produce a customized booklet for the targeted recipient. These limitations are not taught or reasonably suggested by the cited combination of Walker and Harris. Stemmle is not cited as teaching or reasonably disclosing these limitations. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle does not teach or reasonably disclose all of the limitations of claims 46-57. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Walker, Harris and Stemmle is improper as to claims 46-57 and requests that the rejection of claims 46-57 be withdrawn.

Express Mail Label: EV 955981789 US

Appl. No. .: 10/635,773

Amendment Dated November 1, 2006

Response to Office Action Mailed June 30, 2006

C. CONCLUSION

In view of the above information and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the current rejections. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance with claims 1-57. Should any further questions arise concerning this application or in the event the above amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the examiner and the examiner's supervisor prior to any new office action relating to the present Application. Attorney for the Applicant may be reached at the number listed below. The Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees, and conversely, deposit any credit balance, to Deposit Account No. 18-1579.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jon L. Roberts, Ph.D., J.D.

Registration No. 31,293

Elliott D. Light, Esq.

Registration No. 51,948

Roberts Mardula and Wertheim, LLC

11800 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 1000

Reston, VA 20191

703-391-2900